IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE EIGHTH DAY OF NOVEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

-

WRIT PETITION No.34579 of 1998

Between:

S. Padmavathi W/o Chandrasekhar, aged 53 years,
Grade-I Telugu Pandit, U.M.T.S. High School, Arogyavaram,
Chittoor District.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The District Educational Officer, Chittoor.
2 Rt. Rev. Bishop and Chairman, C.S.I. Rayalaseema Diocese Education

Board, Gooty, Ananatapur District.
3 The Regional Joint Director of School Education, Cuddapah.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to pass orders, particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, declaring the orders of the 1st respondent in Rc.No.1162/B2/98, dt.6-9-1998 and the consequential orders, dt.16-11-1998 passed by the 2nd respondent as arbitrary, illegal, and violative of Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India, and contrary to G.O.Ms.No.330, Education Department dt.10-8-1983, and consequently direct the respondents to continue the petitioner at U.M.T.S.Telugu Medium High Scool, Arogyavaram, as per the proceedings of the 2nd respondent dt.26-8-1998.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.KASAJAGANMOHAN REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.1 and 3: GP FOR SCHOOL EDUCATION

Counsel for the Respondent No.2: None appeared.

The Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.34579 OF 1998

-

ORDER:

The order of the first respondent dated 26.08.1998 transferring the petitioner from C.S.I.Girls Schools, Madanapalle to U.M.T.High School, Arogyavaram, was stayed by the first respondent. Assailing which, the present writ petition is filed. It is brought to the notice of this Court that the petitioner is already retired in 2003. As the only question raised in the writ petition is regarding the validity of the orders passed by the District Educational Officer in cancelling the transfer orders, nothing survives in the writ petition as the question raised has become academic. If the petitioner is entitled for any scales of pay or other benefits, she has to seek redressal elsewhere.

The writ petition, with the above observation, is dismissed as infructuous.

_____

(V.V.S.RAO,J)

08.11.2004.

pln

To

1 The District Educational Officer, Chittoor.
2 Rt. Rev. Bishop and Chairman, C.S.I. Rayalaseema Diocese Education

Board, Gooty, Ananatapur District.
3 The Regional Joint Director of School Education, Cuddapah.

4 Two CCs to the Government Pleader for School Education,

High Court Buildings, Hyderabad (O.U.T)

5 Two C.D. Copies.